UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes **Francis Neilson**

Duty to Civilization (*Part IV*)

By FRANCIS NEILSON

Jean Jacques Rousseau

By GEORGE WILLIS COOKE

Potsdam—April 19, 1921

By BRENT DOW ALLINSON

VOLUME LXXXVII NUMBER 13

Chicago, May 26, 1921

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

$3.00 PER ANNUM.

ESTABLISHED 1878

With THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, THE CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS, and all other organizations and individuals seeking to widen fellowship and to realize the Brotherhood of the Spirit unrimmed by creed, form or sectarian prejudices

EDITORS
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
FRANCIS NEILSON

ASSISTANT EDITOR
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE
Pamphlet Mission
FOR
FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER
IN
RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:
Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Frances L. Roberts, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
Frank C. Doan
Charles F. Dole
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
George Grover Mills
Susan M. Quackenbush
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
Albert R. Vail
Arthur L. Weatherly
James H. West

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO, ILL.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

Sample Copies of UNITY Sent Upon Request

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Contents:

EDITORIAL—
Notes.—J. H. H. 195
Duty to Civilization. Part IV.—Francis Neilson 197

THE PULPIT—
The Statesmanship of Jesus—*H. G. Chancellor, M.P* 202

CONTRIBUTED—
Revolutionary Tendencies in Modern Literature. I. Jean Jacques Rousseau.—George Willis Cooke 205
The Burial of the Former Empress at Potsdam, April 19, 1921.—Brent Dow Allinson 206

POETRY—
Are They More Loved?—Lily O. Wilson 195

THE FIELD—
The Public School System of Illinois 207
International League of Good Will 207

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. LXXXVII THURSDAY, MAY 26, 1921 NUMBER 13

ARE THEY MORE LOVED?

Thy followers, Lord, who grasp the key
Of all eternity:
Abiding faith—
Are they more blest than we—?

Are they more loved, oh God, than we
Who doubt—
Who must be shown—
Who see the light only to find
Faith flown—?

Are they more loved, oh Father
Can it be
Who blindly follow—
Are they more loved than we
Who seek to KNOW Thee in the night—
We stumble—fall. They stand upright
Still grasping their blind faith in Thee—
Are they more loved, oh God, than we?

LILY O. WILSON.

To comment on the present situation in Europe is fast becoming impossible for UNITY. Words fail us to express the horror we feel over what is going on, and the reprobation for the men and governments responsible. The language used by Jonathan Edwards in consigning sinners to the pit of hell, would be as a baby's cooing in comparison with what we would like to say. Premiers bicker and snarl, diplomats strike shameless bargains, soldiers clash their shining swords, freebooters fight and ravage—and the multitudes perish of starvation and disease in numbers unparalleled in the blackest periods of human misery! Honest revolution would be to us a welcome substitute for this ruin wrought by the hypocrisies of Christian statesmanship.

The disarmament movement is so important, and is gathering such momentum in this country today, that we propose for the present at least to give it regular mention in these columns, even at the expense of repetition. For this week's contribution to the theme, we offer an impressive bit of testimony by that wise Englishman of letters, Mr. G. Lowes Dickinson. "Madness," he says,

> lies in the renewed attempt, in face of catastrophic failure everywhere and always, to preserve peace by piling up the instruments of war. Any plain man can see what nonsense this is. Nothing stands in the way of complete, all-round disarmament except men's lack of courage to act on a self-evident truth, because they have been inured, by centuries of wrong action, to a palpable lie.

We would be perfectly frank about this matter and confess that we have reached the point where we seriously believe that a man who argues that preparedness for war is a means of maintaining peace, is a man very close to the border-line of insanity. Or at least, if he still possesses rational faculties, he lacks the courage, as Mr. Dickinson points out, to face and act upon "a self-evident truth." In either case, we have a man who constitutes a greater menace to society than any other member of the human species now at large. The self-confessed bomb-thrower, the area of whose destructive influence is a single street or building, and not whole nations and continents, is a "flea-bite" in comparison. We do not believe in suppressing opinion of any kind. But if we were forced or persuaded to begin anywhere, we would begin with the advocate of armaments.

We have been expecting it every day, and here it is! We refer to the announcement that the citizens of Georgia are organizing to denounce Governor Dorsey and secure if possible his impeachment. This Governor, it will be remembered, was the man who published some weeks ago a booklet on "The Negro in Georgia," in which were revealed the horrible conditions of lynching, peonage and maltreatment generally, of which the colored people of this state have long been the helpless victims. Georgia's record on the Negro question has for years been a disgrace alike to Christendom and America, and Governor Dorsey has had the courage to tell the truth about it. The response from his fellow-citizens is just what we expected. A few decent citizens have rallied to his support; the great majority have grumbled and cursed; and now comes the outbreak of resentment in the organized demand for the impeachment of the Governor.

> "Unless Mr. Dorsey is impeached," says a proclamation issued by the Guardians of Liberty, "every Georgian will be *particeps criminis* in his crime of blackening the character of the fairest mother ever had—Georgia. No living man will stand by while a villain defiles his mother. Georgia, our mother, is being defiled before the world. And, by the help of the eternal God, he shall answer for it."

That Governor Dorsey has slandered his state is hotly charged in recent speeches by Governor-Elect Hardwick, Judge William E. H. Searcy, and Sam L. Olive, President of the State Senate. How characteristic all this is of the South! Any love of truth?—none at all! Any desire for justice?—not a trace! Any consciousness of the fact that it is the perpetration of a crime which disgraces a community, and not its disclosure?—*nil!* And always the stolid refusal to acknowledge that the Negro can have a case! To believe that the South will solve the race problem, is as foolish as to believe that there is life on the dead surface of the moon. The South will enslave him if the Negro is docile, and kill him if he is rebellious—and that is all. The

solving of the problem belongs to those who believe in human brotherhood, and fear not to apply this ideal to every relationship among men.

Some weeks ago it was solemnly announced in the newspapers that Lenin had declared that the world revolution was an illusion, and that he had therefore determined to abandon communism. We at once described this report as a canard, not because we knew anything definite about the facts involved in this particular case, but because we knew the mind of Lenin on the one hand, and knew on the other hand the kind of news that had been coming out of Russia for three years past. This report was ridiculous in the eyes of everybody who new anything about the Bolshevists! A well-informed and honest editor would no more have published such an obvious fiction than he would have published a story that Debs had become a Republican, or Lloyd George joined Sinn Fein. Now comes confirmation of our judgment in a solemn news dispatch which asserts that the original report about Lenin's defection was incorrect, and that the Russian Premier is still a communist! Wonder of wonders! the French still want the German reparation, Christians still believe in Christ, the stars still shine and water still runs down hill! It would seem as though there must be a limit to the credulity of newspapers on this Russian business—it would seem as though certain realities would have fixed themselves in this situation as in every other. But apparently not! So great is the fear of the Soviets, and so ardent the wish for their overthrow or conversion, that anything that is food for hope is eagerly devoured. Thus yesterday we read that the Bolsheviki are to restore the currency system of capitalism; and today we learn that Lenin after all is not a monster but "only a figure-head"!

The visit of Mme. Curie is a fit complement to that of Einstein. America is vastly honored by the simultaneous presence of these two most eminent European scientists. Mme. Curie of course stands alone among all women of this or any other age. No woman who has ever lived has to the credit of her name such an achievement as is destined to attach forever to that of the distinguished Frenchwoman. Comparison with members of her own sex, however, is no fair measure of Mme. Curie's attainments, for the scientific field is one of the last into which women have entered. In Mme. Curie's case, all questions of sex become irrelevant. As co-discoverer with her husband of the element, radium, she takes permanent rank with the most famous scientists of modern times —with Faraday, Kelvin, Roentgen and Ramsay. No concessions on sex-grounds are here either necessary or even admissible; this woman stands for what she is, an observer and thinker of the first rank! And is she not also a living prophecy of what some day will be in this world of ours, when men and women work together in all fields of activity, with sex playing as little part as the color of the hair or the shape of the nose? Human beings are not men and women, save for very particular purposes in very narrow areas of experience. In life as a whole, they are to be regarded simply as *persons*, fitted by individual aptitudes for individual types of work. Not the least of Mme. Curie's services to her generation is her contribution to the task of graduating women from the status of sex-creatures to that of full-fledged human beings.

The sudden rise of Mahatma Gandhi into prominence is one of the remarkable news phenomena of the present moment. A few weeks ago his name was unknown to editors and reporters; now it seems to be appearing everywhere. The April 30 issue of *The Independent* devotes its leading article to the great Hindu, and declares that "he has more influence over the millions of India than any political leader has ever had over the people of any country." The May issue of *Current Opinion* and of *Hearst's Magazine* tell his story in special articles. The New York *American* for Sunday, May 8, publishes a full-page feature "special," in which Tagore is quoted as saying that "Gandhi is the greatest man alive today." And we happen to know of another great newspaper in New York which is now preparing a similar article for immediate publication. All this about a man who is a pacifist of the absolutist variety, an out-and-out non-resistant, who is conducting the greatest revolutionary movement in the world today on the basis of Jesus's principle of "love your enemies"! It is evident that Gandhi is capturing the spiritual imagination of the race, as he has already captured the adoring allegiance of his fellow-countrymen in India. In our humble opinion this simple Easterner is the most formidable enemy that the British Empire has ever encountered, for the simple reason that he will not under any circumstances appeal to violence. Unless all signs fail, Gandhi is going to prove on a great scale, as the Quakers have already proved on a small scale, that non-resistance is not only practicable but irresistible. It is love, after all, that "never faileth."

Two books have recently come from the press which we heartily wish might be placed in every home in America, and read by every citizen of the land. If we had a million dollars available, we would spend every cent of it in distributing these volumes. If we were a Congressman, we would have them printed as public documents, and sent broadcast over the country, like the seed packages of the Agricultural Department. Why should not the government seek to

sow ideas, as well as geranimus and turnips! The books to which we refer are, first, Coningsby Dawson's "It Might Have Happened to You," and, secondly, Will Irwin's "The Next War." Dawson's volume tells what the last war did to Europe, more especially central and eastern Europe; Irwin's book tells, on the basis of the accomplishments of this last war, what "the next war" is going to do not merely to Europe but to the world. Both volumes are small, running to scarcely more than one hundred and fifty pages each; they can be read easily in a couple of hours. But their power is like that of a T N T bomb! If militarism, preparedness, belief in war under any circumstances, can survive the explosion of these books in the human brain, we are ready to abandon forthwith the quest of peace. But we have no fears—the books will do their work all right, if they have a chance. The trouble is to get people to read them!

A letter from a Y. M. C. A. worker, dated from Esthonia, on October 19, 1920, has recently fallen into our hands. It says:

> The school system is probably better organized than any system of schools has been in Russia in the old days. The priests teach the Bible regularly and all of them, without exception, are putting the Association emphasis in their teaching.
>
> Not long ago I was visiting our work at Petchory, situated in a famous old monastery, and happened to be sitting in the room of the local secretary, a Russian, and also a priest, when one of the black monks breezed into the room with his long, flowing robes, and said: "Say, Grievsky, where is that 'Social Teachings of Christ'?"
>
> The secretary told me afterwards that he was not the only monk who was reading Rauschenbusch.

We like this testimony, because it awakens tender and grateful memories of that saint, prophet and true martyr of our time, Walter Rauschenbusch. His death was to us one of the crushing losses and most bitter griefs of the war period. How comforting now to have this assurance that "he is not dead," but in far countries, and among strange peoples, as well as here at home, is working still his divine influence of redemption! Rauschenbusch sought no fame, battled for no offices or honors; no life could be quieter or simpler than was his. But he endeavored patiently to

> Speak true, live pure, right wrong, follow the King,

and in this endeavor succeeded beyong the measure of almost any other man of his generation. Already, in his life-time, his example and teaching carried far; now, years after his death, they reach ever wider and deeper spaces, like the unceasing sweep through darkness of a planet's rays. The world is not lost, and hope cannot be dead, while such a spirit survives among us.

Duty to Civilization

IV.

In 1906 there was great rejoicing in the British constituencies when the result of the general election indicated in an unmistakable manner that "jingo imperialism had received its death blow." The British taxpayers had good reason for overthrowing the Balfour administration; it had been responsible for fourteen wars in a period of ten years, and had saddled the country with an enormous debt. The incoming government had pledged itself to the electors to maintain free trade, to break land monopoly, to reduce the enormous expenditure on armaments, and to foster peace and good will among the nations. So far as Grey, Haldane and the other liberal imperialists were concerned, it was impossible for them to abide by the policy. Not to mince matters, the liberal imperialists sold the vast majority of the electors, for when Grey and Haldane took office about a month before the election, they took over an anti-liberal policy from the outgoing ministry, the very one that was utterly repudiated at the general election. Grey's foreign policy never varied. He never faltered in his imperialistic designs. In Europe, Africa and Asia he pursued the path taken by his predecessor. From the first he was false to every liberal tradition.

About two years before he became Foreign Secretary, the Tory party scrapped the old British policy of splendid isolation and joined the group system of Europe. The reasons for Lord Lansdowne's extraordinary deal with the French in April, 1904, were twofold: (1) British Control in Egypt. (2) The settlement of European spheres of influence in Northern Africa. There were many subsidiary reasons for the alliance with the French: one was fear of the economic, financial and commercial growth of Germany, who had become Britain's keenest competitor in the markets of the world; another was Germany's interest in the Bagdad Railway, and her association with Turkey in developing the trade routes leading to the Persian Gulf. Not so immediate, but urgent nevertheless, were the far Eastern questions which had for many years disturbed the governments of Great Britain and Russia; moreover, the economic problem of the settlement of Persia bristled with difficulties.

Turning first to the question of Morocco, there had been nothing but friction between the French and British governments as to their policy in that state since 1891, and, during the last decade of the nineteenth century, the French Foreign Office stubbornly opposed every advance made by Great Britain to assist in "improving the government and administration of the country," to use Lord Salisbury's words. During that period both France and Great Britain repeatedly declared that they would maintain the independence and integrity of the Moroccan State. When, however, M. Delcassé, the jingo imperialist, rose in power in France, a policy of ruthless aggression was begun. How much Edward VII had to do with the schemes of M. Delcassé and his associates will not be determined yet awhile. Still, it is quite probable that the British "peace-making King" was

connected as closely with the financial and commercial developments of Morocco as he was with King Leopold II of Belgium in the profits obtained from rubber taken from the Congo State. At any rate, it is perfectly clear that Edward VII was interested in many French schemes of an imperialistic nature, and that he was largely instrumental in bringing about the Entente Cordiale, Britain's first step in the policy of encircling Germany. How the world was taken in by the ostensible purpose of the Entente is history now, but it is just as well to remember that the secret articles which accompanied the Anglo-French agreement of April, 1904, were not known until November, 1911. These articles for the partition of Morocco by Spain and France, with Britain's consent, were factors in creating the Entente, and such military and naval conversations which began between the British and French General Staffs at that time were aimed solely at Germany. There should be no doubt in anyone's mind now that a complete policy of encirclement was begun in the Spring of 1904, by Great Britain, France and Russia against Germany. Fisher's "Records" show that the policy of "smashing Germany" was initiated as early as 1902. Fisher's "professional career of crime," as he calls his work of preparation, was carried on by him and his colleagues continuously until the war broke out in August, 1914.

Delcassé's statement made shortly after the consummation of the Entente Cordiale, to the effect that if Germany and France quarreled, England was willing to mobolize her fleet, throw the force of 100,000 men into Schleswig-Holstein, and seize the Kiel Canal, was part of the Fisher scheme, but in Fisher's words, "it was not Schleswig-Holstein—that was only a feint to be turned into a reality against the Kiel Canal if things went well. No, the real spot was the Pomeranian Coast under 100 miles from Berlin, where the Russian Army landed in the time of Frederick the Great." Whatever desultory preparations had been undertaken before the signing of the Entente Cordiale, it certainly did not take very long after it was made public for the new allies to set to work with avidity to complete the military, naval and diplomatic encirclement of Germany. In *Le Gaulois,* July 12th, 1905, M. Delcassé, a short time after his downfall, said:

> "Of what importance would the young navy of Germany be in the event of war in which England, I tell you, would assuredly be with us against Germany? What would become of Germany's ports or her trade, or her mercantile marine? They would be annihilated. That is what would be the significance of the visit, prepared and calculated, of the British squadron to Brest, while the return visit of the French squadron to Portsmouth will complete the demonstration. The entente between the two countries and the coalition of their navies, constitutes such a formidable machine of naval war that neither Germany, nor any other Power, would dare to face such an overwhelming force at sea."

Briefly, that was the position of affairs when Sir Edward Grey took office. It was, however, impossible for Grey and Haldane to carry on their work in connection with the French, so long as the policy was not in keeping with the pledges made to the electors; therefore, a change in Parliamentary procedure was necessary, and that change was brought about by removing full and free discussion of foreign affairs from the House. It was not difficult for the inner ring of the Cabinet to set up an Aulic council to work secretly with the military and naval experts, for the vast majority of the people were interested chiefly in burning domestic questions, such as land, tariffs, and Ireland. Thence followed a reign of ministerial deception and chicanery. So far as foreign affairs were concerned, the Parliamentary debates reveal long sustained suppression and prevarication on the part of ministers. How could it be otherwise? They dared not let the liberal party know what they were doing and dream of remaining in office. On the other hand, there was not one of the liberal imperialists that had the courage to tell the electors the truth. An instance or two taken from Hansard will show to what depths ministerial morality fell. On March 8th, 1911:

> "Mr. Jowett asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if, during his term of office, any undertaking, promise or understanding had been given to France that, in certain eventualities, British troops would be sent to assist the operations of the French Army.
>
> "Mr. McKinnon Wood (Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs): 'The answer is in the negative.'"

Later on, Mr. John Dillon said:

> "I interjected an observation on Monday in the speech of one of the speakers who was talking about this question of building against the Triple Alliance, and who insisted for the safety of this Empire on building against the Triple Alliance. I said, What about France? I thought that one of the glories of the British Government had been that it had formed an Entente with France.
>
> "Mr. Lee: 'It is not the same thing as an alliance.'
>
> "Mr. Dillon: 'I should like to know what it is. Some of us have had very uneasy feelings since the other day we read that M. Pichon, the Foreign Minister for France, spoke of constant military conversations going on with England. I say that there is a very uncomfortable feeling among many honorable members that there is a secret alliance with France, or some understanding which

is not known to the members of this House, and if we are to be told that that is the result of all these alliances and understandings, this country must be prepared to build not according to the two Power standard, but up to the three Power standard, which was put forward there tonight.'"

A fortnight later, Mr. Jowett, not satisfied with the answer to his question put to the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, sought information from the head of the Department:

"Mr. Jowett asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, if, when he came into office, there was in existence any understanding or undertaking, expressed or implied, in virtue of which Great Britain would be under obligations to France to send troops, in certain eventualities, to assist the operations of the French Army.

"Sir Edward Grey: 'The extent of the obligations to which Great Britain was committed was that expressed or implied in the Anglo-French Convention laid before Parliament. There was no other engagement bearing on the subject.'"

Then, in connection with Morocco, the question was asked concerning the French Expedition to Fez:

"Mr. Dillon asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the British Government had been consulted by the French Government in reference to the proposed military operations against Fez; and whether the British Government had in any way approved or made itself responsible for this attack on the independence of the Empire of Morocco?

"The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey): 'His Majesty's Government have been informed by the French Government of the measures which are being adopted for the succor of Europeans in Fez, and they understand that information has also been given to other Governments. The action taken by France is not intended to alter the political status of Morocco, and His Majesty's Government cannot see why any objection should be taken to it.'"

Any number of similar instances of suppression and prevarication could be given, but let these suffice as specimens of the kind of lying done by ministers in the House to shield the secret preparations taken in hand by the General Staffs. Yet there are intelligent Americans who seem to be offended when facts are stated that are not to the credit of British ministers. Take the question referring to Morocco put by Mr. Dillon to Grey, and the answer which he received. Grey knew perfectly well that France did intend to alter the political status of Morocco. Indeed he must have known of the secret articles which accompanied the Anglo-French Agreement in 1904, in which it was provided that France and Spain were to partition Morocco with the consent of Great Britain. He must have known when the French, Spanish and British Governments signed the Algeciras Act in 1906, pledging themselves to maintain the independence and integrity of the State of Morocco, that they were committing themselves to a lie, for these three countries were secretly engaged in the work of partitioning Morocco. Furthermore, Grey must have known of the Franco-German Convention of 1909, regarding Morocco, when France in the most barefaced manner solemnly subscribed to the maintenance of the integrity and independence of Morocco, while plans were in operation for the military occupation of the country.

The answer to the French military occupation of Morocco was the appearance of the German gunboat "Panther" at Agadir. The Franco-German Convention of 1909, had been violated by the French, and naturally Germany wanted to know the reason why. Perhaps the clearest commentary on the situation in 1911 was that from the pen of W. T. Stead in *The Review of Reviews*. No one will presume to say Stead was pro-German, or that in referring to the Agadir crisis he was "apologizing for Germany." Stead was a Fisher man, Fisher thought the world of him, and there is no doubt that Stead was one of the best informed men in England on foreign affairs. This is what he had to say of the Moroccan crisis:

"We were nearly involved in the stupendous catastrophe of a gigantic war with the greatest of all the World Powers in order to enable France to tear up the Treaty of Algeciras by taking possession of the Empire of Morocco, whose independence and integrity we were pledged to defend. It is not to our interest to make over to France a vast domain in Northern Africa. . . . The fact remains that in order to put France in possession of Morocco, we all but went to war with Germany. We have escaped war, but we have not escaped the natural and abiding enmity of the German people. Is it possible to frame a heavier indictment of the foreign policy of any British Ministry? The secret, the open secret of this almost incredible crime against treaty faith, British interests, and the peace of the world, is the unfortunate fact that Sir Edward Grey has been dominated by men at the Foreign Office who believe all considerations must be subordinated to the one supreme duty of thwarting Germany at every turn, even if in so doing British interests, treaty faith, and the peace of the world are trampled underfoot. I speak that of which I know."

After the Agadir crisis, there were few men interested in European affairs who believed war could be averted. Speedily things got worse, and the militarists in the House of Commons began to badger

the Government. Mr. Amery, the spokesman in the House of Commons of the Military party, was the first person to raise in a direct manner the question of the secret military obligations Britain was under to France. On July 4th, 1912, he moved to reduce the army estimates by £100, for the purpose of forcing the hand of the Government:

> "My object is to draw the attention of the Committee to the gravity of the military situation as a whole and to the urgent necessity of bringing our military preparations into some sort of correspondence with our general national policy. The point I wish to insist upon to the Committee is that we should face the logical consequences of the policy to which this country already stands committed with the general approval of the great majority on both sides of the House, and that we should shape our military preparations by the same standard by which our naval preparations are invariably determined—the standard, I mean, of the force we may have to encounter in war. . . It is also common ground that in certain eventualities, eventualities which seemed by no means remote less than a year ago, we should be prepared to send a military force to France to assist her. What ought also to be common ground, and no less common ground than those matters I have already mentioned, is that the force thus sent should be adequate to achieve its purpose. If we send a force at all, and it is agreed that we should send it—(Hon. Members: No.) It is by the great majority on both sides of this House, and if we send a force at all we should send it to make sure of victory and not to share a defeat. . . . Let me remind the Committee that since the crisis of last year Germany has added very considerably to her navy. Immediately, and with the assent of every one, we responded by a substantial increase of our navy. May I also remind the Committee that since that same crisis Germany has added 80,000 men to her army for the express purpose of strengthening the force that is to march through Belgium to crush the French left. It is upon our Expeditionary Force that the brunt of that march would fall."

Every militarist in England knew after the Agadir affair that war was inevitable. Lord Haldane knew that Britain was bound to fight on the side of the French, and though Mr. Asquith in 1912 had the effrontery to declare in the House of Commons, "I say, and I say this deliberately, we have no cause, and so far as I know, no occasion for quarrel with any country in any part of the world," he had a few months before sent Mr. Winston Churchill to the Admiralty for the express purpose of preparing the fleet for war. At Dundee, June 5th, 1915, Mr. Churchill confessed that he was sent to the Admiralty in 1911: "After the Agadir crisis had nearly brought us into war, I was sent with the express duty laid upon me by the Prime Minister to put the fleet in a state of instant and constant readiness for war in case we were attacked by Germany." There was scarcely a week in the year 1912 when the question of war with Germany was left out of the speeches of prominent statesmen, soldiers and sailors. Lord Charles Beresford was particularly bitter against the First Lord of the Admiralty for dragging Germany into his speeches on naval affairs. Lord Roberts went up and down the country making speeches against Germany which offended even his own supporters. The *Evening Standard,* by no means a pacifist organ, said: "At a time when all prudent people on both sides of the North Sea are endeavoring to establish better relations between the two peoples, it is mere wanton mischief-making for a man with Lord Roberts's unequalled prestige to use words which must drive every German who reads them to exasperation."

The hostility and bitterness which was fomented in the chief British, French, Russian and German papers during that year, amazed such men as Lord Bryce and Lord Morley, who commented with deep regret upon the way things were going. People "in the know" repeatedly referred to "the inevitable war." Those who kept in close touch with foreign affairs knew events were taking shape that were beyond the control of Parliament. The policy inaugurated by Delcassé in Morocco, together with that of Isvolsky, in the Black Sea and Persia, committed Great Britain to military and naval action too terrible to contemplate. Grey's policy was fast tending to an European catastrophe. The French occupation of Morocco in the summer of 1911, and the violation of the pledges given to Germany that Great Britain, France and Spain would maintain the independence and integrity of Morocco meant war, and nothing civilians in Europe could do could avert it. Every secret preparation made by military and naval authorities of the Entente Powers was consummated and ratified in 1912. In November of that year, the King of Belgium called the House of Parliament to a secret sitting to consider urgent military precautionary measures. The King had become possessed of facts of a threatening nature; these he disclosed to Parliament, who listened attentively to his warnings, and immediately adopted a drastic military program, which had been delayed for thirty years, one which King Leopold II had advocated in vain. The drastic program the Belgian Parliament adopted raised the war strength of the Belgian Army to 150,000 for the field army, 60,000 for auxiliary services, and 130,000 for garrisons; in all, a force of 340,000 men. The for-

tifications of the Meuse were strengthened, and neutral Belgium, a country supposedly protected by five of the principal European Powers from war, got ready for the fray.

And all these terrible preparations were made against a country whose army in the year of the Agadir crisis was in a condition so unsatisfactory to the mind of militarists that Colonel Repington, the military correspondent of the London *Times,* October 28th, 1911, in his conclusions on the army manœuvers, wrote the following:

> "The writer has not formed a wholly favorable opinion of the German Army, which appears to him to be living on a glorious past and to be unequal to the repute in which it is commonly held. . . . There is insufficient test of the initiative of commanders of any units, large or small. . . . There was nothing in the higher leading at the manœuvers of a distinguished character, and mistakes were committed which tended to shake the confidence of foreign spectators in the reputation of the command. The infantry lacked dash, displayed no knowledge of the use of ground, intrenched themselves badly, were extremely slow in their movements, offered vulnerable targets at medium ranges, ignored the service of security, performed the approach marches in an old-time manner, were not trained to understand the connection between fire and movement, and seemed totally unaware of the effect of modern fire. The cavalry drilled well and showed some beatifully trained horses, while the cavalry of the Guard was well handled from the Army point of view, but the arm was in many ways exceedingly old fashioned, the scouting was bad, and mistakes were made of which our Yeomanry would be ashamed. The artillery, with its out-of-date *matériel* and slow and ineffective methods of fire, appeared so inferior that it can have no pretensions to measure itself against the French on anything approaching level terms. Finally, the dirigibles and aeroplanes presented the fourth arm in a relatively unfavorable light. The German Army, apart from its numbers, confidence in itself, and high state of organization, does not present any signs of superiority over the best foreign models, and in some ways does not rise above the level of the second rate. . . . It appears to the writer to have trained itself stale. Year in, year out, the same ceaseless round of intensive training has reduced the whole Army to a machine. Everybody does the same thing every hour of every day every year, and officers who have to wait sixteen or seventeen years for their companies are spent and tired long before they rise to high command. . . . Failing extreme measures, the best thing to restore new life to the Army would be disband it for a year in order to give everybody, from top to bottom, a much needed rest. . . . The nation which, after all, gives up little more than half of its able-bodied sons to the Army, is becoming less militarist than formerly. The military spirit in the country is less predominant than of old and the race for wealth is the consuming passion of the day. . . . Although the physique is still good, there has been a steady deterioration for many years past in the physical qualifications of recruits. The German Army has seen less of modern war than any other which stands in the front rank. . . . The contempt which it displays for the effects of modern fire, and professes to hold for the armies of rival States with which it may come in conflict, can only be set down to ignorance."

Such evidence from so distinguished an authority on military questions makes one wonder why the Entente Powers were so mortally afraid of what they called "the German menace." Perhaps they thought it advisable that "the best foreign models" should make no mistake about the job. Be that as it may, the revelations in the French newspapers show to what extent the Entente prepared for the conflict against the Army that in 1911 Colonel Repington said should disband for a year for a much needed rest. A communication in *Gil Blas,* February 25th, 1913, said:

> "A contemporary paper of Eastern France contains most remarkable disclosures. In Eastern military circles it is discussed that the fortress of Maubeuge, situated near the northeastern frontier of France, close to the railway line Paris-Cologne, receives, since several weeks, great quantities of English ammunition. Maubeuge is of the greatest military importance. In the plan of campaign of the French General Staff, it is the point of concentration of the allied Anglo-French troops, which in case of war will be commanded by the English General French, under the French Generalissimo Joffre. It is known that the English cannons do not use the same kind of projectiles as the French cannons. Therefore, both governments have agreed to lay in store, already in peace time, on French territory, such quantities of ammunition as will be necessary for the English artillery."

Whether those who prepared for the war thought it a duty to civilization to make Europe what it is, cannot be said, though it should have been patent to any, but a military mind, that civilization would go down with Europe.

FRANCIS NEILSON.

THE PULPIT

The Statesmanship of Jesus

A Sermon Preached in Highfield Congregational Church, Huddersfield, England, by H. G. Chancellor, M. P.

"Righteousness exalteth a nation; but sin is a reproach to any people."—Prov. xiv, 34.

"Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you."—Matt. vi, 33.

Policy is the conduct of states. Politics is the body of principles on which policy is founded, and which is embodied in laws and shown in their administration. If personal religion is the beliefs and principles and, above all, the spirit animating and governing personal conduct, then politics is the religion of states and communities. Hypocrisy has been described as the tribute vice pays to virtue. But really, however consistent or inconsistent with his profession, a man's conduct is his real religion in action. That is as true of the rogue as of the saint, of the hypocrite as of the martyr.

Many men have three religions, one for social life, one for business, one for politics. To secure a bargain they will justify to themselves conduct they would abhor and shrink from in the relations of family or of friendship. To obtain party advantage they will stoop to slander, innuendo, misrepresentation and that form of lying that Tennyson says "is ever the worst of lies," the half truth which they would not permit themselves even in business.

They say religion has nothing to do with business or politics. That is not so. They mean that their political religion differs from their business, and their business religion from their social. Jesus is recognized as the inspired teacher of personal righteousness, the prophet of God, aye, by many as even God Himself. But those who pay lip-service to Him as all wise and omniscient, if asked to apply His teachings to the government of states, especially in their international relations, would regard you as a fool. Jesus is all very well in the Church and Sunday School and home. But He was no statesman. In the realm of statesmanship His inspiration does not run, and His omniscience is nescience, His wisdom nonsense. Of course men do not say that about Him, only about those that accept His teaching as true for the State as for the individual. *If they are fools, so was Jesus.* There is no escape from the dilemma.

Was Jesus, then, a statesman? In the limited sense usually given to the word, No! He never led a party or administered a department of state. But in the wide and real sense I want to show you He was the greatest statesman who ever lived, whose policy is practical, and, if adopted, would solve all state problems and make impossible a world calamity like the one we are suffering now.

A political state is a development and organ of society. It exists to conserve and develop the common life of the units who form it, and to protect that life from evils and dangers within and without. Those evils and dangers all arise from one cause, breaking the laws of life. "Sin is the transgression of the law." That is as true of the state as of the individual. Transgression is due mainly, if not altogether, to two fundamental sources. The first is lack of knowledge. The second is unregulated or ill-regulated desire. The one can be remedied by experience, the other by self-control. Sins of ignorance are just as disastrous, though not so morally culpable as sins against the light. These latter in the individual take the form of seeking gratification at the expense of others: in the state of allowing or perpetrating injustice between different sections of citizens, or of inflicting them upon other states in the pursuit of national interest or ambition.

Statesmanship consists in understanding the true laws of the life of states, and inspiring or influencing their policy in accordance therewith. That is its root function, to which successful administration, on which political reputation is mainly built up, though important, is merely secondary. In the progress towards our ideal of ordered freedom England owes more to the statesmanship of Hampden than of Stafford, of Milton and Locke than of Clarendon or Walpole, of Thomas Payne than of William Pitt, of John Bright than of Russell or Beaconsfield.

Judged by that standard, let us look at the teaching of Jesus as applied to state policy. Careful readers of the sayings of Jesus will be surprised at the political implications involved in many passages usually held to be of purely personal application. His whole gospel is a gospel of the kingdom. The term kingdom of God, kingdom of heaven, and sometimes merely kingdom appears throughout.

Now a kingdom is one form of state. It implies government, law, administration. The use of the term implies His recognition of the state, and the doctrines of anarchism can only be deduced from His words by distorting their plain meaning or reading into them what is not there.

In that collection of His great sayings called the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v., vi., and vii.) He expounds the foundation principle of state policy. The cure for their worry and anxiety about food and clothing is to be found in it.

"Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness (*i. e.*, rightness or justice) and all these things shall be added unto you" (Matt. vi., 33). Justice is the foundation of the Commonwealth. The passage, "Be not anxious for the morrow," is no excuse for idleness and lack of forethought. The duty of laboring is plainly taught elsewhere. But where justice is there need be no grinding poverty and hunger, and the nightmare of unemployment that haunts the lives of the poor would disappear. Justice would insure to all who would work the opportunity to work, and poverty would only result from voluntary idleness. It would make impossible the exploitation of one man by another, by conferring equal freedom upon both, and thus transform the artificial and unjust inequality of wealth into the just, because natural inequality of personal gifts, moral, mental and physical.

Under existing conditions riches mean more than possession. They mean power over others, irrespective of the character of their owner, which may be vastly inferior to that of those others, whether measured by wisdom or skill or any other element required to produce the riches he possesses. But this power is due not to the possession of riches in itself, but to the nature of the system under which they are accumulated. That system consists in the ownership of opportunity, and the consequent power to deny opportunity to others. Opportunity is God's gift to His children, all of them. Denial of this to any one is denial of God's righteousness or justice, under which Jesus tells us "all these things shall be added," and

anxiety for life's necessaries removed. Now the mere ownership of wealth could not in itself prevent others from producing wealth for themselves. The only thing which can do that is ownership of the sources of wealth. If these are owned individually, then material can be denied to the producer, who without the material by working on which alone can wealth be produced, is reduced to dependence on its owner. That material is just the natural resources of the earth, which, the Psalmist says, God "hath given to the children of men." The denial of the use of the earth, or in other words of opportunity for self-employment to so many of His children is the fundamental injustice which makes tyranny, oppression, poverty and hunger not only possible but inevitable. Breaking down the monopoly of the few in the sources of wealth God gave to all is the essential preliminary to the establishment of God's justice, and of right relations between His children. That relation now the world over is one between employer and employed, between master and man, which leads me to the next point.

In the discourse in which He denounced the Scribes and Pharisees, the tyrants with whom He was most familiar, Jesus warned His followers "Neither be ye called masters, for one is your Master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant." (Matt. xxiii., 10-11).

In His kingdom none would be masters forcing others to do their bidding or to starve; but all would be servants, not of the individual but of the whole. The relationship would be that of brethren, all free, all serving. The mark of distinction in its politics would be service, not possession. The lesson is repeated at the solemn feast, the last supper they had together. The disciples still thought He was to establish a political kingdom, and disputed which should have the highest posts. Jesus rebuked them. "The kings of the Gentiles have lordship over them: and they that have authority over them are called Benefactors. But ye shall not be so: but he that is greater among you let him become as the younger: and he that is chief as he that doth serve." (Luke xxii., 25-26).

So the Christian state, if it ever comes into existence, will be democratic, free, fraternal. There will be no kings or lords, only citizens. Its politics will be based not on intrigue nor on monopoly, but on service. Its distinctions will be those not of social position or wealth, but of character and capacity. It will be based on justice—God's justice—and have no room for privilege. Its king will be God: its laws His will: and the instrument for administering them the collective will of those coming under them, His children. By destroying monopoly of opportunity, and with it the power of one to live upon others, its economic and industrial life will cease to be that of enforced labor and unwilling servitude, and become a life of personal industry, in which free men will voluntarily co-operate in mutual service for the common weal.

Impossible, you say; Utopian; the vision not of a statesman but of an unpractical dreamer. Well! Perhaps Jesus was only that. But some dreams come true. The man who first tried to fly was an unpractical dreamer. In a recently-published volume, "Glances Back," Mr. G. R. Sims says:

> It was not so many years ago that one of our great authorities on the brain, giving instances of insane delusions, quoted the case of a man who believed it would be possible to sail the air and carry passengers from point to point.

But men fly today far above the heights ever reached by the eagle. He was only before his time.

The fact that men, even His professed followers, have not yet grasped the thought of Jesus so far as to apply it, is no proof that they never will. In the furnace of affliction they are today learning the fatal consequences of ignoring or defying the laws of life, and the cry for justice as the only means of security for small states and large ones alike is shaping itself into a demand for a brotherhood of nations, leagued together the world over for mutual co-operation and defence. The very blunders of diplomacy are teaching the former enemies of His teaching that their statesmanship is mere amateurishness and blundering, which only leads to destruction and death, whilst His statesmanship of brotherhood alone can save the life of mankind, because it is based on the true laws of life.

We often contrast the law and the gospel, as if they were antipathetic. There is no such contrast. The law and the gospel are one. Jesus declared: "I came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill." (Matt. v., 17). The universality of law, the perception of which has undermined and overthrown the belief in miracle, is claimed as a discovery of nineteen century science. It is nothing of the kind. Science has only in nineteen centuries at last verified the great generalization Jesus proclaimed that law was eternal, and that heaven and earth would pass away before one tittle of the law could fail. Statesmanship not based on law must fail. But the law is not what Parliaments enact or nations embody in treaties. It is the law which God has written in the nature of things and in human life. Legislation that counteracts that law must fail, whether in the sphere of home or foreign affairs, of domestic or international relations. The laws of life were put by Jesus in two forms, moral and practical.

"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," neighbor being not merely one living near, not exclusively fellow-citizen, but also foreigner, as shown in the Parable of the Good Samaritan.

"Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you."

Ideal counsels, you say, but contrary to nature. If so, they are not laws at all, but lies, and obeying them would be fatal because of that.

But is the Golden Rule contrary to nature? Yes! if human nature is all selfishness, and if self-interest is its only animating motive. No! if human nature in its very essence is also love, as it is. Observe the Golden Rule does not demand that you should treat others better than, but the same as you would wish them to treat you. It is not generosity, but justice that is insisted upon. Justice rules out privilege. It puts men on an equality, and renders impossible the possession of power over others which privilege confers. Privilege is a violation of Nature's law, however many statutes may bolster it up. It consists mainly of one thing, power to shut off others from the means of life. It makes attractive and exaggerates the selfish side of human nature at the expense of its altruistic side, which is correspondingly starved. But if justice equalized opportunity, making one man as free as another, so limiting the scope for the selfish instincts that a man could only serve himself by serving his fellows, the selfish motive would blend with the unselfish, and following the Golden Rule would come as natural as now seems the ghoulish greed that produces slavery and

servitude, with their hideous brood of poverty, disease and suffering.

If I understand it aright, the statesmanship of Jesus aims at bringing about the natural development of human life by creating such an environment that the predatory instinct is held in check by conditions in which serving others, *i. e.,* altruism, shall become the one means by which man can best serve himself. Present conditions are unnatural. The laws which sanction monopoly, privilege and power based on private ownership in God's gift to mankind, the earth and the raw material of all wealth, are against the laws of life, so that they must needs fail, as they always have failed. Bring the laws of property into harmony with those of life, so that human nature may develop as a whole, individual possession being based on and limited by individual production, not extended by power to exploit others, and the reality of brotherhood as the natural relationship of men one to another would become so self-evident that its spirit would enter and fill men's souls by a natural process that would remove the cause of most of the quarrels that embitter life, and most of its vice and crime. Then greatness would be measured by service, and ambition would take nobler forms. Politics would be purified, and government would mean not dominance but service. "He that is chief" would be "as him that serveth." The false idealism that produces plunder and tyranny in pursuit of glory and wealth would give place to the true idealism, which, because it is true, and follows the natural and therefore divine law, is the only form of practical statesmanship that can solve political and social and industrial problems.

Statesmanship current in all ages and in most countries has been based on the lopsided view of human nature involved in the horrible doctrine that man is "born in sin and shapen in iniquity." Its keynote is "Thou shalt not," and has reached its apotheosis in the German word "verboten." Its laws are prohibitions maintained by penalties. It concerns itself largely in making legal crimes of conduct that are not morally wrong. It is more concerned with rights than with right, with power and privilege and possession than with justice, equality and freedom. In other words it is not natural but artificial, and therefore, because it violates natural law, is doomed to the penalty of such violation, futility, failure and consequent suffering.

The statesmanship of Jesus, on the contrary, is based on a complete view of human nature. It sees in the abandoned Magdalene a potential saint, in moral depravity a perversion of qualities in themselves good. It seeks to make the laws of the state conform to the laws of God, and to remove from the straight path of moral rectitude the artificial barriers that divert human motive and conduct into the byways of selfishness and sin. Its keynote is not negative but positive; not "thou shalt not," but "thou shalt," not prohibition, but education, not artificial restraint, but natural freedom. The state has its functions and its rights. "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." But those functions and rights are limited. Jesus reserves to the individual rights which the all-powerful state must not invade. "Unto God the things that are God's." In the last resort conscience, the law of God written in the heart, is supreme over the decrees of the state, even the democratic state. For the citizen of His kingdom is not the potential criminal tainted with original sin, but the innocent child developed through just laws and wise guidance. "Of such is the kingdom of God."

When Jesus said "the kingdom of God is within you," He uttered a profound truth which world statesmanship ignores. The whole aim of true statesmanship should be to find in its laws and institutions an outward expression of this inward kingdom. That can only be done by learning the laws of life revealed in human nature *as a whole,* and by making statutes and institutions that harmonize with them. This would moralize politics, substitute freedom for domination, and justice for privilege. Carried into the region of world politics, it would explode the false idea that the prosperity of one state militates against that of another, show that in international affairs and personal alike co-operation is the law of life, that mutual service is the best way to promote self-service, and thus remove the cause of war by changing the motives that lead to war, or rather by turning those same motives into a right channel.

The breakdown of the old statesmanship, especially in its international aspect, diplomacy, with the awful suffering and horror its outcome in this war is inflicting on the world, has already turned the minds of statesmen and citizens alike in the direction to which Jesus pointed ninteen hundred years ago. Out of the welter and chaos of the times comes the cry of human hearts the world over for a practical policy of comradeship instead of conflict, of brotherhood instead of enmity, for a League of Nations to make war impossible.

Within such a League each member nation, immune from aggression and domination from without, would cease to prostitute its genius and industry to produce instruments of death and destruction, and use them to increase the means of life. Freedom from the hampering influence of monopoly and privilege within would be found the best means of increasing home production, of abolishing unemployment, and of equitably distributing wealth. Exchange of its own surplus for the surplus of sister nations would be found the readiest means of further increasing the means of life for its own citizens. Freeing such exchange from tariff hindrances would secure its fullest benefits to all parties. Trade would be found to be not war, but co-operation in mutual service. Freedom of trade would develop mutual intercourse, and intercourse understanding. To dissipate misunderstanding is to substitute friendship for the mistrust and hatred that lead to war, for to understand is to love. All the nations would find their individual interests in the freest and fullest mutual exchange of natural advantages. Thus patriotism would be shorn of its parochialism and exclusiveness, and love of country would involve love of mankind for country's sake.

It will thus be seen that the statesmanship of Jesus, though idealistic in the loftiest degree, is not Utopian, but practical, and based on a prosaic groundwork of economic, social and national interest, and on the laws of life as revealed in human nature as a whole, with all its elements considered.

Perhaps, who knows? we are in the birth throes of a new era, in which by merely substituting justice for force, Jesus shall come into His own, and Christendom shall cease to be a geographical expression, and shall acquire its real meaning, the dominion of Christ. God grant that the horror of this world war may reveal to men the hideous mistake of division and discord,

and show them their essential oneness as members of the one family of the "One God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all and in all." Then will His statesmanship give to the world "peace on earth, good will to men."

CONTRIBUTED

Revolutionary Tendencies in Modern Literature

I.

JEAN JACQUES ROUSSEAU

Rousseau, 1712-1778, was one of the first thinkers to define the relations between the individual and society in such a manner as to make it fairly clear what they are. In his early writings he was distinctly an individualist, pleading for freedom and rights, and with such an influence, perhaps not very considerable, as to aid in bringing about the revolution. He was, and is, credited with that influence, whatever it may have been in fact. The real cause of the revolution was the refusal of the middle class in France to submit to industrial and economic conditions conducive almost wholly to the interests of the aristocracy. The situation had reached such a pass, as Taine has shown, that the governing class had become autocratic and tyrannical. They were blind to the conditions around them, and would not concede needed reforms. Rousseau gave voice in some degree to the desire for more of equity and justice. He pleaded for the rights of the people in his earlier works, as he did in his later productions.

In his later and greater works Rousseau gave emphasis to the influence of society over the individual. He conceived of society as a collective power, and of the state as a sociological entity, guiding and controlling the individual. His idea of a collective will was one which had considerable influence on his thinking. He never positively defined the relations of the individual and society, the citizen and the state. His conception of these relations as that of contract he borrowed from Montesquieu, Hobbes, Locke and others; but it was based on a fundamental misconception of the nature of primitive society. He thought that at first men were free, and that everywhere later on they had been brought into a condition of slavery. In time men thought it best to give up something of their personal freedom, and agreed to act together for the common good, making with each other a social contract to that effect. In view of the general ignorance of primitive conditions, it is not surprising that this theory found acceptance.

Rousseau's emphasis on both the individual and society, never positively defining to himself how they are related to each other, has led to his being accepted as the originator of both anarchism and socialism. What he actually taught in regard to this problem has been clearly defined by Prof. C. E. Vaughan of Leeds University, in a two-volume edition of his Political Writings. In this work all his writings bearing on sociology, the state, and political problems, have been brought together from the original French editions or from his manuscripts. Extensive introductions and notes give the student all facilities for an understanding of his theories in regard to the nature of society, the state and the relations to them of the individual. It is of the very first importance for the comprehension of eighteenth century thought in France, and its effect on the thinking and action subsequent to Rousseau.

Not only has Rousseau had a considerable influence on sociological thinking in the years since his time, but he has also done much to shape psychological speculation. Nearly every philosophical thinker (Kant as well as most others), has been indebted to him, directly or through the general movements of thought in the succeeding years. He set in motion currents of thought which have by no means spent their force even at the present day. The evolutionary emphasis on feeling and emotion (the instincts not less) may be traced back to him in no inconsiderable degree. He vigorously combatted the idea that reason is the supreme expression of man's life, and that by means of it alone he arrives at the truth in morals and philosophy.

Rousseau was a romanticist in literature; and that movement, at least in its beginnings, owes more to him than to any other. Classic literature was distinctly formal, reasoned, and unemotional. Romanticism sought what is natural, emotional, spontaneous, and without regard to formal rules. It rejected the old demand for unity, rationality, and moderation. The romanticists gave feeling free expression, broke away from all artificial laws, gave free vent to the inner life, too often became mystical and obscure, and, while claiming to follow nature, were by no means always loyal to its leadings.

In his romances, such as "Emile" and "The New Heloise," Rousseau was desultory, gushing, emotional, obscure. In these writings he pleaded for love, sympathy, and acceptance of the natural. It is said that he convinced French fashionable women to nurse their own children, and that he brought about a great change in manners, convincing both women and men to have regard to what is spontaneous and free. His books were read with great eagerness, were the talk of the day, and were enthusiastically approved, as well as fiercely condemned. Probably it is not too strong a statement to say that he was the most influential man in France for a time, not lasting more than ten or fifteeen years. Nor was the fashion which accepted him as a new guide and prophet confined to France, for his teachings were widely accepted throughout Europe.

Rousseau borrowed much from the English poets and novelists who were pleading for a return to nature, who were developing realism in literature, who were describing human nature accurately and appreciatively; but he gave back more than he received. Nearly every writer in the immediately succeeding years in England owed a large debt to him, more than any words of theirs could express. On German literature and philosophy his influence was profound, not only in the awakening of the romatic movement there, but in shaping the newer and nobler tendencies in religion. Fichte, Hegel, Schelling, Novalis, Heine, Schleiermacher and many others, drew inspiration from his writings.

In England Coleridge, and the whole broad church movement, owed much to his leading. Rousseau was a theist, in considerable degree a free-thinker, and he gave a very broad interpretation to the dogmas of Christianity. He taught a simple faith in God, in immortality, and in suggesting a human following of

Christ. Beyond this he was thoroughly liberal, though with emotional and mystical tendencies.

The influence of Rousseau has been greatest in the direction of education. In this field of modern effort every leader has harked back to him, and found in his ideas sources of inspiration. He has been followed by Pestalozzi, Froebel, Horace Mann, Spenser, and their successors, as to the nature and purpose of education. He appealed to nature, the need of relating training to the purposes of society, preparation for a life of usefulness, and recognition of moral incentives. Nature study, learning by means of practice, acceptance of science in its spirit and not in its mere details, are in the line of his influence on education. In so far as educational methods have departed from his guidance, it has been in the direction of the acceptance of science rather than the classics, and in a much more thorough knowledge of the laws of psychology than had been arrived at in his day.

The most outspoken and self-revealing book of "Confessions" ever written is that of Rousseau. He laid bare his whole life in all its weaknesses and defects. Indeed, he gave a more depreciatory account of himself than had been that of his enemies, and he had plenty of them. He wrote of himself in such a manner that his faults stood out above his virtues, his vices as of more importance than his genius. This phase of Rousseau's life and writings has been recently dealt with by Mrs. Frederika Macdonald in "A New Criticism" of his life. She has made it probable, if not certain, that he did not send his children to a foundling hospital as soon as they were born; in fact, that no children were born to him. The other tales told by his enemies she has shown to be of a doubtful nature, and not to have been based on fact, at least in the case of many of them. Even so, Rousseau had his many weaknesses the result in no small measure of his lack of thorough training in youth, his inability to think clearly on some subjects, and his serious defects as an interpreter of philosophical problems.

In recent years it has been the custom to depreciate Rousseau, and to reject many of his teachings as defective. What is to be considered, however, is the nature and strength of his influence, that he was one of the leaders of modern thought, that the tendencies emanating from him have been deep and wide-reaching. The students of education, art, religion, philosophy, nationality and ethics find traces of his influence in every direction. He settled no modern problems, but he suggested many new lines of thought and endeavor. His was an adventurous mind, a quickener of thought, a pioneer into new realms.

Thomas Davidson said that it has been given to few men to exert with their thought an influence so deep and pervasive as that of Rousseau. George Saintsbury sees in Rousseau before all else a describer of the passions of the human heart and of the beauties of nature. One of the ablest books on Rousseau is that of Joseph Texte, who finds him a leader of the cosmopolitan movement, and one of the greatest of international influences. W. H. Hudson is of the opinion that human warmth, sympathy and spontaneity came from his influence into life and literature. "We have never seen in our generation," wrote Henry Maine—"indeed, the world has not seen more than once or twice in all the course of history—a literature which has exercised such prodigious influence over the minds of men as that which emanated from Rousseau between 1749 and 1762." GEORGE WILLIS COOKE.

The Burial of the Former Empress at Potsdam, April 19, 1921

This morning six of us drove to Potsdam to see the funeral of the former Kaiserin. It was a beautiful spring day, and the woods and blossoming fruit-trees along the route were superb—*"herrlich,"* as the Germans say so expressively. In Potsdam, in the stately gardens of Sans Souci, the great fountain was throwing a stream of living water into the glorious sunlight, and the winding paths were black with people, most of them, of course, of richer degree. Here and there in the crowd the copper and silver helmets of the old-style officers in full regalia glittered in the sun, and the field-gray uniforms of generals, rotund and svelt, punctuated the procession. In the center of the great park, between the two palaces, that are a mile or more apart, surrounded by a grove of noble pine trees, stood the circular "Antiken Tempel," besieged by a great throng and defended by the green-uniformed and mounted police of the present government, who were the incarnation of courtesy as they pressed back the crowds with their extended arms, calling as they did so: "Bitte, zurueck; bitte, Ruhe!" It was all very orderly and picturesque, with a strange note of sedate comic-opera about it and a touch or two of familiarity, as if it were tacitly understood that the *ancien régime* who were here in force, might have the footlights for the day without danger of unpleasant cat-calls, or something worse, from the wings or the pit.

Two enormous catafalques stood at one side, laden with wreathes and flowers from various cities, and leagues, and schools, bearing affectionate inscriptions upon their ribbons to "Unserer Landesmutter!" Groups of young people marched past, bearing a standard inscribed "The Young People's League of the German National Party"; a cohort or two of soldiers passed, carrying "a banner with a strange device," reading, "The National-Minded Legion," and delegations of officers, gorgeous in sashes and medals, with spiked and fur-trimmed helmets passed, carrying embroidered gonfalons, which they dipped as they moved before the open door of the little temple within whose guarded shadows lay the bier, surrounded by a hundred burning tapers. There was not the slightest disturbance to be remarked during the ceremony; there was no note of music; the police were infinitely more courteous and fewer in numbers than one would find on duty at any public procession in America; and the whole affair had a gracious and peaceful setting, which was as unusual as it was gratifying at the funerals of monarchs.

Had we investigated the city of Potsdam we should have found that a great change has come over it, that only a lonely sentry stands, for example, where once stood the marshalled hosts of Prussianism. In some of the military barracks hungry children are being served a nourishing meal every day at the hands of the American Friends Service Committee, and no pomp is to be seen. On the return drive we travelled for four or five miles over a straight, broad highway called "The Avenue of the Army" that had been built for the troops to use in their parades from Berlin to their barracks in Doeberitz. We found the avenue absolutely deserted, from one end to the other, and the old refrain *"Sic transit gloria mundi"* ran through my head, as I re-entered the city more hopeful than ever that a great and substantial democracy is rising here in Germany upon the dust and ashes of kings.

Berlin, Germany. BRENT D. ALLINSON.

THE FIELD.

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM OF ILLINOIS.

It would seem to be time that the citizens of the State of Illinois, and particularly of the City of Chicago, should awake to the serious situation in which the public school system now finds itself. According to the United States census report, Illinois, which ranks fourth in the list of states in the relation of its taxable wealth to the number of pupils enrolled in its schools, ranks thirty-third in the amount actually spent for schools for each $100 of its taxable wealth, and twenty-eighth in the amount spent for each pupil in daily attendance.

The Chicago High School Teachers' Council, among other organizations, is conducting a campaign of education upon the financial status of the public school system and urging a program of legislation which should remedy the situation somewhat.

They ask every individual to write to his state senator and the three representatives from his district at Springfield and urge their support of four definite things for the benefit of the public schools:

A—Put Chicago on an equality with the rest of the state in regard to its tax-rate for school support. This means that the Juul law shall be so amended as to exempt educational funds from its operation.

B—Make it possible for Chicago and other Illinois cities to levy and collect for High and Continuation Schools an additional rate beyond that now permitted for the support of all their schools, without requiring the division of administration between two boards of education. This can be accomplished by amendment of the Township and Community High School laws.

C—Increase the State Appropriation from $6,000,000 to $20,000,000 in order to make it possible to maintain efficient schools throughout the state and to equalize educational opportunity in Illinois.

D—Grant the State University and the State Normal Schools adequate support so that the work of training teachers may be efficiently done.

They also urge organizations to pass resolutions favoring these measures and send them to their congressmen, and they are glad to furnish speakers who will explain the matter to any group or organization that is willing to listen to such a speaker. Speakers and literature may be obtained from the Chicago High School Teachers' Council, 1024 Garrick Theatre Building, Chicago, Ill. Telephone State 8846.

INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE OF GOOD WILL.

A group of us are putting forth the idea of an International League of Good Will—a thought, merely, so simple that we seem to have missed it in our civilization; yet not so simple, either, when we try to work it out as an every-day proposition. It is astonishing how often it does miss-out—this Good-Will—in thought, comment or action, just in the little things of life, when one tries to hold the idea and apply it! It really isn't much wonder that our "Christian Civilization" seems to disintegrate easily in its larger international relationships, for, of course, the civilization we talk about in a world sense is made up of the quality and fibre of the individual soul. If that does not stand the test, naturally the larger structure composed of it is no stronger.

It looks to us as if we had struck into something foundational in this thought of Good Will as the cementing power. It is nothing new—as old as Christianity, and as familiar; yet the world seems to lack it, somehow. To us it appeals as a *getting down to the real thing* in Christian living and therefore vastly important to the welfare of us all. We merely send out the idea. If it appeals to you, too, join us and pass it on.

PREAMBLE.

Whereas, War has disrupted the world and let loose upon it all those latent evils that awake in the train of cruelty and hate; and

Whereas, We would unite to overcome these conditions that are threatening our civilization; therefore, be it

Resolved, That we seek an answer to the question, "On what can we concentrate, men of all beliefs, men of all nations to bring about the spirit of social and international peace which the world so sorely needs?"

We believe that a common and fundamental ground of action is indicated in the saying which greeted the advent of the Leader of Christianity—

"On earth peace to men of good will"

and therefore we propose in answer to that question, an

International League of Good Will.

STATEMENT.

This League is not an organization, but a fellowship of those who believe that Good Will is the essential human expression of the spirit of God and the basis of any civilization that is to endure. That Good Will only, lived out daily, can overcome hatred, prejudice, discontent and misunderstanding between neighbors and races.

GOOD WILL.

Good Will is not merely a kindly, passive attitude of mind toward others. It is more aggressively helpful than that, patiently determined to understand, actively willing to do the right thing—and doing it—speaking no evil, but telling the good in others (and there is always some good).

Good Will is strength and overcomes hatred which is weakness.

THE CALL.

The call is to you, to join this League, increasing by so much the spirit of Good Will in the world.

MEMBERSHIP.

There are no dues. You elect yourself.

The duties of membership are to show Good Will (as herein defined), just where you are and as you are; to "put in friendly words across the barriers of social and racial prejudice, hate and malignity"; and to spread this League of Good Will to others, throughout this and other countries, as frequently as opportunity offers, and persistently.

Issued by the International League of Good Will First Group, Summit, New Jersey, U. S. A., with whom other groups forming will please communicate, and from whom these printed copies may be obtained free. Postage requested.

LINCOLN CENTRE LITTLE THEATRE.

The success of some of the Little Theatre performances this spring has called for their repetition, and a most interesting program is to be given at Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Thursday evening, June 2, at 8 o'clock. This will be for the benefit of the Woman's International League for Peace and Freedom, Chicago Branch. The Hull House Players will present one play from a recent Irish program of theirs, "O'Flaherty, V. C.," with Laura Dainty Pelham as *Mrs. O'Flaherty*. The opening play will be "The Magic Shop" by the Lincoln Centre Festival Dancers, under the direction of Miss Middlebrook of the Lincoln Centre Staff, and the program will close with a repetition of Lady Gregory's "The Rising of the Moon" by the Lincoln Centre Senior Players. Admission 50 cents.

THE WAYS OF THE GODS

By ALGERNON SIDNEY CRAPSEY

(International Press, 150 Lafayette Street, New York)

Is attracting wide and favorable notice. The New York *Herald* speaks of it as "an historical and sociological study vast in range and original in conception." The *Evening Post* says, "it is simply and intelligibly written." The Chicago *Herald-Examiner* calls it a "Flaming Book."

"The Ways of the Gods" is passing to its second printing.

BAKER AND TAYLOR COMPANY

Trade Selling Agents

354 Fourth Avenue **New York**

Price $3.00. 400 pages with list of authorities and index.
Bound in blue and silver gray. *To read it is an education.*

church building was destroyed by fire. As a consequence the Sunday morning service is held in one of the large theatres off Broadway, and it says much for the power of the minister and his colleagues, and for the sincerity of their enterprise, that a great congregation is held together week after week in circumstances which, one might have thought, would be fatal to any endeavor after communal worship or meditation. John Haynes Holmes, it should be added, is eloquent in a particular manner that is almost unknown today among his countrymen or ours. In political and social opinion he is a radical, and an outspoken opponent of war. And if an English inquirer or critic were to ask him for a short statement of the spirit of the Community Church, he would probably answer in the words of a poem by one of the younger poets of New York, Louis Untermeyer:

Ever insurgent let me be,
Make me more daring than devout;
From sleek contentment keep me free,
And fill me with a buoyant doubt!

Manchester Guardian. —*S. K. R.*

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM—DOMESTIC

COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028

Main Office:

28 E. Jackson Blvd.

CHICAGO

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

728 E. 39th Street

Phone Douglas 244

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S

4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

THE ECONOMIC FOUNDATIONS OF THE CHURCH

By GEORGE WILLIS COOKE

Write for pamphlet to the

Unity Publishing Company

700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago

Reprinted from UNITY

Price 10 cents. Ten copies, 50 cents

DUTY TO CIVILIZATION

A Pamphlet answering many questions as to the causes of the Great War, written by FRANCIS NEILSON, author of "How Diplomats Make War," etc., Editor of THE FREEMAN and Associate Editor of UNITY.

This pamphlet will appeal to all those who believe the true history of the war and its causes is yet to be written, and that it is essential to the best development of our civilization.

Published by the

UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY

Price, 30 Cents **700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO**

Reprinted from UNITY

Bowman Dairy Company

MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY

Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk

DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?

4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices

EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 221
ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS:
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.

PRINTERS and BINDERS

Telephone Wabash 3854 **120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO**